

**NOV 09 2005**

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

CAMERINO M. LOPEZ, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MARY K. CARR; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 04-15172

D.C. No. CV-97-01059-RCB

MEMORANDUM<sup>\*</sup>

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Arizona  
Robert C. Broomfield, District Judge, Presiding

Argued and Submitted October 19, 2005  
San Francisco, California

Before: WALLACE, TROTT, and RYMER, Circuit Judges.

Lopez appeals from the district court's judgment, entered pursuant to Rule 50 motions, disposing of all of his claims. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm for the reasons stated by the district court.

---

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

Lopez has failed to establish a violation of his constitutional rights. In his eleven-day termination hearing, he was represented by counsel, testified at length, presented twenty witnesses, and cross-examined adverse witnesses. The hearing did not violate due process. *See Codd v. Velger*, 429 U.S. 624, 627 (1977) (per curiam); *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 333-35 (1976). His allegations of bias and error in the proceedings do not rise to the level of a due process violation. *See Hortonville Joint Sch. Dist. No. 1 v. Hortonville Educ. Ass'n*, 426 U.S. 482, 491-93, 496-97 (1976); *Withrow v. Larkin*, 421 U.S. 35, 55 (1975).

Additionally, Lopez's state law claim of intentional interference with contract was properly dismissed. *See Wallace v. Casa Grande Union High Sch. Dist. No. 82 Bd. of Governors*, 909 P.2d 486, 494-95 (Ariz. Ct. App. 1995).

**AFFIRMED.**